Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	1 ''	
	10/567,367	BALEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JOHN PAK	1616
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>JOHN PAK</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>MICHAEL WHITHAM</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 April 2011	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: Examiner Pak faxed a claim amendment draft proposal for further review. Copy of this fax is attached hereto.		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:  All  Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.		
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Application No. 10/567,367

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed a claim amendment as set forth in the attached fax, pending further search update and review to determine ultimate patentability or non-patentability (see statements to that effect in the fax copy). The proposed claims were for the purpose of finding subject matter that both parties could agree to for pursuing allowance. On 4/15/2011, Mr. Whitham notified the Examiner that applicant would not accept the claims as proposed. Applicant wanted to delete the last clause, "wherein no other fungicide is applied to the crop." Therefore, no agreement could be reached.